

Article

Majorization and Karamata Inequality

MathLinks - www.mathlinks.ro

Pham Kim Hung, Stanford University, US

Note

This is an excerpt from the second volume of "Secrets In Inequalities", by Pham Kim Hung. The author thanks sincerely Darij Grinberg for some of his materials about Symmetric Majorization Theorem, posted on Mathlinks Forum. Please don't use this excerpt for any commercial purpose.

The Author always appreciates every Contribution to this content- Majorization and Karamata Inequality.

Best Regard,
Pham Kim Hung

Chapter 1

Theory of Majorization

The theory of majorization and convex functions is an important and difficult part of inequalities, with many nice and powerful applications. We will discuss in this article the **Karamata** inequality; however, it's necessary to review first some basic properties of majorization.

Definition 1. Given two sequences $(a) = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ and $(b) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ (where $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R} \ \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$). We say that the sequence (a) majorizes the sequence (b) , and write $(a) \gg (b)$, if the following conditions are fulfilled

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &\geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n ; \\ b_1 &\geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n ; \\ a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n &= b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n ; \\ a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k &\geq b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k \ \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\} . \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2. For an arbitrary sequence $(a) = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$, we denote (a^*) , a permutation of elements of (a) which are arranged in increasing order: $(a^*) = (a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \dots, a_{i_n})$ with $a_{i_1} \geq a_{i_2} \geq \dots \geq a_{i_n}$ and $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n\} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Here are some basic properties of sequences.

Proposition 1. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be real numbers and $a = \frac{1}{n}(a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n)$, then

$$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^* \gg (a, a, \dots, a).$$

Proposition 2. Suppose that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n)$ is an arbitrary permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, n)$, then we have

$$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \gg (a_{\pi(1)}, a_{\pi(2)}, \dots, a_{\pi(n)}).$$

Proposition 3. Let $(a) = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ and $(b) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ be two sequences of real numbers. We have that (a^*) majorizes (b) if the following conditions are fulfilled

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &\geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n ; \\ a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n &= b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n ; \\ a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k &\geq b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\} ; \end{aligned}$$

These properties are quite obvious: they can be proved directly from the definition of Majorization. The following results, especially the Symmetric Majorization Criterion, will be most important in what follows.

Proposition 4. If $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n$ and $y_1 \geq y_2 \geq \dots \geq y_n$ are positive real numbers such that $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n = y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_n$ and $\frac{x_i}{x_j} \geq \frac{y_i}{y_j} \quad \forall i < j$, then

$$(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \gg (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n).$$

PROOF. To prove this assertion, we will use induction. Because $\frac{x_i}{x_1} \leq \frac{y_i}{y_1}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we get that

$$\frac{x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n}{x_1} \leq \frac{y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_n}{y_1} \Rightarrow x_1 \geq y_1.$$

Consider two sequences $(x_1 + x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n)$ and $(y_1 + y_2, y_3, \dots, y_n)$. By the inductive hypothesis, we get

$$(x_1 + x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n) \gg (y_1 + y_2, y_3, \dots, y_n).$$

Combining this with the result that $x_1 \geq y_1$, we have the conclusion immediately.

▽

Theorem 1 (Symmetric Majorization Criterion). Suppose that $(a) = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ and $(b) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ are two sequences of real numbers; then $(a^*) \gg (b^*)$ if and only if for all real numbers x we have

$$|a_1 - x| + |a_2 - x| + \dots + |a_n - x| \geq |b_1 - x| + |b_2 - x| + \dots + |b_n - x|.$$

PROOF. To prove this theorem, we need to prove the following.

(i). *Necessary condition.* Suppose that $(a^*) \gg (b^*)$, then we need to prove that for all real numbers x

$$|a_1 - x| + |a_2 - x| + \dots + |a_n - x| \geq |b_1 - x| + |b_2 - x| + \dots + |b_n - x| \quad (\star)$$

Notice that (\star) is just a direct application of **Karamata** inequality to the convex function $f(x) = |x - a|$; however, we will prove algebraically.

WLOG, assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n$, then $(a) \gg (b)$ by hypothesis. Obviously, (\star) is true if $x \geq b_1$ or $x \leq b_n$, because in these cases, we have

$$\text{RHS} = |b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n - nx| = |a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n - nx| \leq \text{LHS}.$$

Consider the case when there exists an integer $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ for which $b_k \geq x \geq b_{k+1}$. In this case, we can remove the absolute value signs of the right-hand expression of (\star)

$$\begin{aligned} |b_1 - x| + |b_2 - x| + \dots + |b_k - x| &= b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k - kx ; \\ |b_{k+1} - x| + |b_{k+2} - x| + \dots + |b_n - x| &= (n - k)x - b_{k+1} - b_{k+2} - \dots - b_n ; \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we also have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |a_i - x| \geq -kx + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i,$$

and similarly,

$$\sum_{i=k+1}^n |a_i - x| = \sum_{i=k+1}^n |x - a_i| \geq (n - k)x - \sum_{i=k+1}^n a_i.$$

Combining the two results and noticing that $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k b_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - x| &\geq (n - 2k)x + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - \sum_{i=k+1}^n a_i \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i + (n - 2k)x \geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^k b_i - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i + (n - 2k)x = \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i - x|. \end{aligned}$$

This last inequality asserts our desired result.

(ii). *Sufficient condition.* Suppose that the inequality

$$|a_1 - x| + |a_2 - x| + \dots + |a_n - x| \geq |b_1 - x| + |b_2 - x| + \dots + |b_n - x| \quad (\star\star)$$

has been already true for every real number x . We have to prove that $(a^*) \gg (b^*)$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n$. Because $(\star\star)$ is true for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, if we choose $x \geq \max\{a_i, b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - x| &= nx - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i ; \quad \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i - x| = nx - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i ; \\ \Rightarrow a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n &\leq b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if we choose $x \leq \min\{a_i, b_i\}_{i=1}^n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - x| &= -nx + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i ; \quad \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i - x| = -nx + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i ; \\ \Rightarrow a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n &\geq b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n. \end{aligned}$$

From these results, we get that $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n = b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n$. Now suppose that x is a real number in $[a_k, a_{k+1}]$, then we need to prove that $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k \geq b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k$. Indeed, we can eliminate the absolute value signs on the left-hand expression of $(\star\star)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |a_1 - x| + |a_2 - x| + \dots + |a_k - x| &= a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k - kx ; \\ |a_{k+1} - x| + |a_{k+2} - x| + \dots + |a_n - x| &= (n - k)x - a_{k+1} - a_{k+2} - \dots - a_n ; \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - x| &= (n - 2k)x + 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i. \end{aligned}$$

Considering the right-hand side expression of $(\star\star)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i - x| &= \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i - x| + \sum_{i=k+1}^n |x - b_i| \\ &\geq -kx + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i + (n - k)x - \sum_{i=k+1}^n |b_i| = (n - 2k)x + 2 \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| - \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|. \end{aligned}$$

From these relations and $(\star\star)$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (n - 2k)x + 2 \sum_{i=1}^k a_i - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i &\geq (n - 2k)x + 2 \sum_{i=1}^k |b_i| - \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i| \\ \Rightarrow a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k &\geq b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the desired result. The proof is completed.

▽

The Symmetric Majorization Criterion asserts that when we examine the majorization of two sequences, it's enough to examine only one conditional inequality which includes a real variable x . This is important because if we use the normal method, there may too many cases to check.

The essential importance of majorization lies in the **Karamata** inequality, which will be discussed right now.

Chapter 2

Karamata Inequality

Karamata inequality is a strong application of convex functions to inequalities. As we have already known, the function f is called convex on \mathbb{I} if and only if $af(x) + bf(y) \geq f(ax + by)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{I}$ and for all $a, b \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, we also have that f is convex if $f''(x) \geq 0 \forall x \in \mathbb{I}$. In the following proof of **Karamata** inequality, we only consider a convex function f when $f''(x) \geq 0$ because this case mainly appears in Mathematical Contests. This proof is also a nice application of **Abel** formula.

Theorem 2 (Karamata inequality). *If (a) and (b) two numbers sequences for which $(a^*) \gg (b^*)$ and f is a convex function twice differentiable on \mathbb{I} then*

$$f(a_1) + f(a_2) + \dots + f(a_n) \geq f(b_1) + f(b_2) + \dots + f(b_n).$$

PROOF. WLOG, assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n$. The inductive hypothesis yields $(a) = (a^*) \gg (b^*) = (b)$. Notice that f is a twice differentiable function on \mathbb{I} (that means $f''(x) \geq 0$), so by **Mean Value** theorem, we claim that

$$f(x) - f(y) \geq (x - y)f'(y) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{I}.$$

From this result, we also have $f(a_i) - f(b_i) \geq (a_i - b_i)f'(b_i) \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n f(b_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (f(a_i) - f(b_i)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i)f'(b_i) \\ &= (a_1 - b_1)(f'(b_1) - f'(b_2)) + (a_1 + a_2 - b_1 - b_2)(f'(b_2) - f'(b_3)) + \dots + \\ &+ \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b_i \right) (f'(b_{n-1}) - f'(b_n)) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \right) f'(b_n) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

because for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we have $f'(b_k) \geq f'(b_{k+1})$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k b_i$.

Comment. 1. If f is a non-decreasing function, it is certain that the last condition $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$ can be replaced by the stronger one $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$.

2. A similar result for concave functions is that

★ If $(a) \gg (b)$ are number arrays and f is a concave function twice differentiable then

$$f(a_1) + f(a_2) + \dots + f(a_n) \leq f(b_1) + f(b_2) + \dots + f(b_n).$$

3. If f is convex (that means $\alpha f(a) + \beta f(b) \geq f(\alpha a + \beta b) \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \geq 0, \alpha + \beta = 1$) but not twice differentiable ($f''(x)$ does not exist), **Karamata** inequality is still true. A detailed proof can be seen in the book **Inequalities** written by G.H Hardy, J.E Littlewood and G.Polya.

▽

The following examples should give you a sense of how this inequality can be used.

Example 2.1. If f is a convex function then

$$f(a) + f(b) + f(c) + f\left(\frac{a+b+c}{3}\right) \geq \frac{4}{3} \left(f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right) + f\left(\frac{b+c}{2}\right) + f\left(\frac{c+a}{2}\right) \right).$$

(Popoviciu-Titu Andreescu inequality)

SOLUTION. WLOG, suppose that $a \geq b \geq c$. Consider the following number sequences

$$(x) = (a, a, a, b, t, t, t, b, b, c, c, c) \quad ; \quad (y) = (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \beta, \beta, \beta, \gamma, \gamma, \gamma, \gamma) \quad ;$$

where

$$t = \frac{a+b+c}{3} \quad , \quad \alpha = \frac{a+b}{2} \quad , \quad \beta = \frac{a+c}{2} \quad , \quad \gamma = \frac{b+c}{2} \quad .$$

Clearly, we have that (y) is a monotonic sequence. Moreover

$$a \geq \alpha, 3a + b \geq 4\alpha, 3a + b + t \geq 4\alpha + \beta, 3a + b + 3t \geq 4\alpha + 3\beta,$$

$$3a + 2b + 3t \geq 4\alpha + 4\beta, 3a + 3b + 3t \geq 4\alpha + 4\beta + \gamma,$$

$$3a + 3b + 3t + c \geq 4\alpha + 4\beta + 2\gamma, 3a + 3b + 3t + 3c \geq 4\alpha + 4\beta + 4\gamma.$$

Thus $(x^*) \gg (y)$ and therefore $(x^*) \gg (y^*)$. By **Karamata** inequality, we conclude

$$3(f(x) + f(y) + f(z) + f(t)) \geq 4(f(\alpha) + f(\beta) + f(\gamma)),$$

which is exactly the desired result. We are done.

▽

Example 2.2 (Jensen Inequality). If f is a convex function then

$$f(a_1) + f(a_2) + \dots + f(a_n) \geq n f\left(\frac{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n}{n}\right).$$

SOLUTION. We use property 1 of majorization. Suppose that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$, then we have $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \gg (a, a, \dots, a)$ with $a = \frac{1}{n}(a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n)$. Our problem is directly deduced from **Karamata** inequality for these two sequences.

▽

Example 2.3. Let a, b, c, x, y, z be six real numbers in \mathbb{I} satisfying

$$a + b + c = x + y + z, \max(a, b, c) \geq \max(x, y, z), \min(a, b, c) \leq \min(x, y, z),$$

then for every convex function f on \mathbb{I} , we have

$$f(a) + f(b) + f(c) \geq f(x) + f(y) + f(z).$$

SOLUTION. Assume that $x \geq y \geq z$. The assumption implies $(a, b, c)^* \gg (x, y, z)$ and the conclusion follows from **Karamata** inequality.

▽

Example 2.4. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be positive real numbers. Prove that

$$(1 + a_1)(1 + a_2) \dots (1 + a_n) \leq \left(1 + \frac{a_1^2}{a_2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{a_2^2}{a_3}\right) \dots \left(1 + \frac{a_n^2}{a_1}\right).$$

SOLUTION. Our inequality is equivalent to

$$\ln(1 + a_1) + \ln(1 + a_2) + \dots + \ln(1 + a_n) \leq \ln\left(1 + \frac{a_1^2}{a_2}\right) + \ln\left(1 + \frac{a_2^2}{a_3}\right) + \dots + \ln\left(1 + \frac{a_n^2}{a_1}\right).$$

Suppose that the number sequence $(b) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ is a permutation of $(\ln a_1, \ln a_2, \dots, \ln a_n)$ which was rearranged in decreasing order. We may assume that $b_i = \ln a_{k_i}$, where (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n) is a permutation of $(1, 2, \dots, n)$. Therefore the number sequence $(c) = (2 \ln a_1 - \ln a_2, 2 \ln a_2 - \ln a_3, \dots, 2 \ln a_n - \ln a_1)$ can be rearranged into a new one as

$$(c') = (2 \ln a_{k_1} - \ln a_{k_1+1}, 2 \ln a_{k_2} - \ln a_{k_2+1}, \dots, 2 \ln a_{k_n} - \ln a_{k_n+1}).$$

Because the number sequence $(b) = (\ln a_{k_1}, \ln a_{k_2}, \dots, \ln a_{k_n})$ is decreasing, we must have $(c')^* \gg (b)$. By **Karamata** inequality, we conclude that for all convex function x then

$$f(c_1) + f(c_2) + \dots + f(c_n) \geq f(b_1) + f(b_2) + \dots + f(b_n),$$

where $c_i = 2 \ln a_{k_i} - \ln a_{k_i+1}$ and $b_i = \ln a_{k_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Choosing $f(x) = \ln(1 + e^x)$, we have the desired result.

Comment. 1. A different choice of $f(x)$ can make a different problem. For example, with the convex function $f(x) = \sqrt{1 + e^x}$, we get

$$\sqrt{1 + a_1} + \sqrt{1 + a_2} + \dots + \sqrt{1 + a_n} \leq \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_1^2}{a_2}} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_2^2}{a_3}} + \dots + \sqrt{1 + \frac{a_n^2}{a_1}}.$$

2. By **Cauchy-Schwarz** inequality, we can solve this problem according to the following estimation

$$\left(1 + \frac{a_1^2}{a_2}\right)(1 + a_2) \geq (1 + a_1)^2.$$

▽

Example 2.5. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be positive real numbers. Prove that

$$\frac{a_1^2}{a_2^2 + \dots + a_n^2} + \dots + \frac{a_n^2}{a_1^2 + \dots + a_{n-1}^2} \geq \frac{a_1}{a_2 + \dots + a_n} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{a_1 + \dots + a_{n-1}}.$$

SOLUTION. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we denote

$$y_i = \frac{a_i}{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n}, \quad x_i = \frac{a_i^2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + \dots + a_n^2}$$

then $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n = y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_n = 1$. We need to prove that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{1 - x_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{1 - y_i}.$$

WLOG, assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$, then certainly $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n$ and $y_1 \geq y_2 \geq \dots \geq y_n$. Moreover, for all $i \geq j$, we also have

$$\frac{x_i}{x_j} = \frac{a_i^2}{a_j^2} \geq \frac{a_i}{a_j} = \frac{y_i}{y_j}.$$

By property 4, we deduce that $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \gg (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$. Furthermore,

$$f(x) = \frac{x}{1 - x}$$

is a convex function, so by **Karamata** inequality, the final result follows immediately.

▽

Example 2.6. Suppose that $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2n})$ is a permutation of $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{2n})$ which satisfies $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_{2n} \geq 0$. Prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + a_1 a_2)(1 + a_3 a_4) \dots (1 + a_{2n-1} a_{2n}) \\ & \leq (1 + b_1 b_2)(1 + b_3 b_4) \dots (1 + b_{2n-1} b_{2n}). \end{aligned}$$

SOLUTION. Denote $f(x) = \ln(1 + e^x)$ and $x_i = \ln a_i, y_i = \ln b_i$. We need to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x_1 + x_2) + f(x_3 + x_4) + \dots + f(x_{2n-1} + x_{2n}) \\ & \leq f(y_1 + y_2) + f(y_3 + y_4) + \dots + f(y_{2n-1} + y_{2n}). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the number sequences $(x) = (x_1 + x_2, x_3 + x_4, \dots, x_{2n-1} + x_{2n})$ and $(y) = (y_1 + y_2, y_3 + y_4, \dots, y_{2n-1} + y_{2n})$. Because $y_1 \geq y_2 \geq \dots \geq y_n$, if $(x^*) = (x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ is a permutation of elements of (x) which are rearranged in the decreasing order, then

$$y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_{2k} \geq x_1^* + x_2^* + \dots + x_{2k}^*,$$

and therefore $(y) \gg (x^*)$. The conclusion follows from **Karamata** inequality with the convex function $f(x)$ and two numbers sequences $(y) \gg (x^*)$.

▽

If these examples are just the beginner's applications of **Karamata** inequality, you will see much more clearly how effective this theorem is in combination with the Symmetric Majorization Criterion. Famous Turkevici's inequality is such an instance.

Example 2.7. *Let a, b, c, d be non-negative real numbers. Prove that*

$$a^4 + b^4 + c^4 + d^4 + 2abcd \geq a^2b^2 + b^2c^2 + c^2d^2 + d^2a^2 + a^2c^2 + b^2d^2.$$

(Turkevici's inequality)

SOLUTION. To prove this problem, we use the following lemma

★ *For all real numbers x, y, z, t then*

$$2(|x| + |y| + |z| + |t|) + |x + y + z + t| \geq |x + y| + |y + z| + |z + t| + |t + x| + |x + z| + |y + t|.$$

We will not give a detailed proof of this lemma now (because the next problem shows a nice generalization of this one, with a meticulous solution). At this time, we will clarify that this lemma, in combination with **Karamata** inequality, can directly give Turkevici's inequality. Indeed, let $a = e^{a_1}, b = e^{b_1}, c = e^{c_1}$ and $d = e^{d_1}$, our problem is

$$\sum_{cyc} e^{4a_1} + 2e^{a_1+b_1+c_1+d_1} \geq \sum_{sym} e^{2a_1+2b_1}.$$

Because $f(x) = e^x$ is convex, it suffices to prove that (a^*) majorizes (b^*) with

$$(a) = (4a_1, 4b_1, 4c_1, 4d_1, a_1 + b_1 + c_1 + d_1, a_1 + b_1 + c_1 + d_1) ;$$

$$(b) = (2a_1 + 2b_1, 2b_1 + 2c_1, 2c_1 + 2d_1, 2d_1 + 2a_1, 2a_1 + 2c_1, 2b_1 + 2d_1) ;$$

By the symmetric majorization criterion, we need to prove that for all $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ then

$$2|a_1 + b_1 + c_1 + d_1 - 4x_1| + \sum_{cyc} |4a_1 - 4x_1| \geq \sum_{sym} |2a_1 + 2b_1 - 4x_1|.$$

Letting now $x = a_1 - x_1, y = b_1 - x_1, z = c_1 - x_1, t = d_1 - x_1$, we obtain an equivalent form as

$$2 \sum_{cyc} |x| + \sum_{cyc} |x| \geq \sum_{sym} |x + y|,$$

which is exactly the lemma shown above. We are done.

▽

Example 2.8. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be non-negative real numbers. Prove that

$$(n-1)(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + \dots + a_n^2) + n\sqrt[n]{a_1^2 a_2^2 \dots a_n^2} \geq (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n)^2.$$

SOLUTION. We realize that Turkevici's inequality is a particular case of this general problem (for $n = 4$, it becomes Turkevici's). By using the same reasoning as in the preceding problem, we only need to prove that for all real numbers x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n then $(a^*) \gg (b^*)$ with

$$(a) = (\underbrace{2x_1, 2x_1, \dots, 2x_1}_{n-1}, \underbrace{2x_2, 2x_2, \dots, 2x_2}_{n-1}, \dots, \underbrace{2x_n, 2x_n, \dots, 2x_n}_{n-1}, \underbrace{2x, 2x, \dots, 2x}_n);$$

$$(b) = (x_1 + x_1, x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_3, \dots, x_1 + x_n, x_2 + x_1, x_2 + x_2, \dots, x_2 + x_n, \dots, x_n + x_n);$$

and $x = \frac{1}{n}(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n)$. By the Symmetric Majorization Criterion, it suffices to prove that

$$(n-2) \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right| \geq \sum_{i \neq j}^n |x_i + x_j|.$$

Denote $A = \{i \mid x_i \geq 0\}$, $B = \{i \mid x_i < 0\}$ and suppose that $|A| = m$, $|B| = k = n - m$. We will prove an equivalent form as follows: if $x_i \geq 0 \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ then

$$(n-2) \sum_{i \in A, B} x_i + \left| \sum_{i \in A} x_i - \sum_{j \in B} x_j \right| \geq \sum_{(i,j) \in A, B} (x_i + x_j) + \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} |x_i - x_j|.$$

Because $k + m = n$, we can rewrite the inequality above into

$$(k-1) \sum_{i \in A} x_i + (m-1) \sum_{j \in B} x_j + \left| \sum_{i \in A} x_i - \sum_{j \in B} x_j \right| \geq \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} |x_i - x_j| \quad (\star)$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\sum_{i \in A} x_i \geq \sum_{j \in B} x_j$. For each $i \in A$, let $|A_i| = \{j \in B \mid x_i \leq x_j\}$ and $r_i = |A_i|$. For each $j \in B$, let $|B_j| = \{i \in A \mid x_j \leq x_i\}$ and $s_j = |B_j|$. Thus the left-hand side expression in (\star) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i \in A} (k - 2r_i)x_i + \sum_{j \in B} (m - 2s_j)x_j.$$

Therefore (\star) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in A} (2r_i - 1)x_i + \sum_{j \in B} (2s_j - 1)x_j + \left| \sum_{i \in A} x_i - \sum_{j \in B} x_j \right| &\geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i \in A} r_i x_i + \sum_{j \in B} (s_j - 1)x_j &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that if $s_j \geq 1$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ then we have the desired result immediately. Otherwise, assume that there exists a number $s_l = 0$, then

$$\max_{i \in A \cup B} x_i \in B \Rightarrow r_i \geq 1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{i \in A} r_i x_i + \sum_{j \in B} (s_j - 1) x_j \geq \sum_{i \in A} x_i - \sum_{j \in B} x_j \geq 0.$$

This problem is completely solved. The equality holds for $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_n$ and $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_{n-1}, a_n = 0$ up to permutation.

▽

Example 2.9. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be positive real numbers with product 1. Prove that

$$a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n + n(n-2) \geq (n-1) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt[n-1]{a_1}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt[n-1]{a_2}} + \dots + \frac{1}{\sqrt[n-1]{a_n}} \right).$$

SOLUTION. The inequality can be rewritten in the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + n(n-2) \sqrt[n]{\prod_{i=1}^n a_i} \geq (n-1) \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt[n-1]{\prod_{j \neq i} a_j}.$$

First we will prove the following result (that helps us prove the previous inequality immediately): if x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are real numbers then $(\alpha^*) \gg (\beta^*)$ with

$$(\alpha) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, x, x, \dots, x) \quad ;$$

$$(\beta) = (y_1, y_1, \dots, y_1, y_2, y_2, \dots, y_2, \dots, y_n, y_n, \dots, y_n) \quad ;$$

where $x = \frac{1}{n}(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n)$, (α) includes $n(n-2)$ numbers x , (β) includes $n-1$ numbers y_k ($\forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$), and each number b_k is determined from $b_k = \frac{nx - x_i}{n-1}$.

Indeed, by the symmetric majorization criterion, we only need to prove that

$$|x_1| + |x_2| + \dots + |x_n| + (n-2)|S| \geq |S - x_1| + |S - x_2| + \dots + |S - x_n| \quad (\star)$$

where $S = x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n = nx$. In case $n = 3$, this becomes a well-known result

$$|x| + |y| + |z| + |x + y + z| \geq |x + y| + |y + z| + |z + x|.$$

In the general case, assume that $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n$. If $x_i \geq S \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ then

$$\text{RHS} = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - S) = -(n-1)S \leq (n-1)|S| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + (n-2)|S| = \text{LHS}.$$

and the conclusion follows. Case $x_i \leq S \ \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is proved similarly. We consider the final case. There exists an integer k ($1 \leq k \leq n-1$) such that $x_k \geq S \geq x_{k+1}$. In this case, we can prove (\star) simply as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RHS} &= \sum_{i=1}^k (x_i - S) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n (S - x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i - \sum_{i=k+1}^n x_{k+1} + (n-2k)S, \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + (n-2k)|S| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + (n-2)|S| = \text{LHS}, \end{aligned}$$

which is also the desired result. The problem is completely solved.

▽

Example 2.10. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be non-negative real numbers. Prove that

$$(n-1)(a_1^n + a_2^n + \dots + a_n^n) + na_1 a_2 \dots a_n \geq (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n)(a_1^{n-1} + a_2^{n-1} + \dots + a_n^{n-1}).$$

(Suranji's inequality)

SOLUTION. We will prove first the following result for all real numbers x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n

$$n(n-1) \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + n|S| \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n |x_i + (n-1)x_j| \quad (1)$$

in which $S = x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n$. Indeed, let $z_i = |x_i| \ \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $A = \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, i \in \mathbb{N}, x_i \geq 0\}$, $B = \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, i \in \mathbb{N}, x_i < 0\}$. WLOG, we may assume that $A = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $B = \{k+1, k+2, \dots, n\}$, then $|A| = k$, $|B| = n-k = m$ and $z_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in A \cup B$. The inequality above becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &n(n-1) \left(\sum_{i \in A} z_i + \sum_{j \in B} z_j \right) + n \left| \sum_{i \in A} z_i - \sum_{j \in B} z_j \right| \\ &\geq \sum_{i, i' \in A} |z_i + (n-1)z_{i'}| + \sum_{j, j' \in B} |(n-1)z_j + z_{j'}| + \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} (|z_i - (n-1)z_j| + |(n-1)z_i - z_j|) \end{aligned}$$

Because $n = k + m$, the previous inequality is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &n(m-1) \sum_{i \in A} z_i + n(k-1) \sum_{j \in B} z_j + n \left| \sum_{i \in A} z_i - \sum_{j \in B} z_j \right| \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} |z_i - (n-1)z_j| + \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} |(n-1)z_i - z_j| \quad (\star) \end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in A$ we denote

$$B_i = \{j \in B \mid (n-1)z_i \geq z_j\}; \quad B'_i = \{j \in B \mid z_i \geq (n-1)z_j\};$$

For each $j \in B$ we denote

$$A_j = \{ i \in A \mid (n-1)z_j \geq z_i \} ; \quad A'_j = \{ i \in A \mid z_j \geq (n-1)z_i \} ;$$

We have of course $B'_i \subset B_i \subset B$ and $A'_i \subset A_i \subset A$. After giving up the absolute value signs, the right-hand side expression of (\star) is indeed equal to

$$\sum_{i \in A} (mn - 2|B'_i| - 2(n-1)|B_i|) z_i + \sum_{j \in B} (kn - 2|A'_j| - 2(n-1)|A_j|) z_j.$$

WLOG, we may assume that $\sum_{i \in A} z_i \geq \sum_{j \in B} z_j$. The inequality above becomes

$$\sum_{i \in A} (|B'_i| + (n-1)|B_i|) z_i + \sum_{j \in B} (|A'_j| + (n-1)|A_j| - n) z_j \geq 0.$$

Notice that if for all $j \in B$, we have $|A'_j| \geq 1$, then the conclusion follows immediately (because $A'_j \subset A_j$, then $|A_j| \geq 1$ and $|A'_j| + (n-1)|A_j| - n \geq 0 \ \forall j \in B$). If not, we may assume that there exists a certain number $r \in B$ for which $|A'_r| = 0$, and therefore $|A_r| = 0$. Because $|A_r| = 0$, it follows that $(n-1)z_r \leq z_i$ for all $i \in A$. This implies that $|B_i| \geq |B'_i| \geq 1$ for all $i \in A$, therefore $|B'_i| + (n-1)|B_i| \geq n$ and we conclude that

$$\sum_{i \in A} (|B'_i| + (n-1)|B_i|) z_i + \sum_{j \in B} (|A'_j| + (n-1)|A_j| - n) z_j \geq n \sum_{i \in A} z_i - n \sum_{j \in B} z_j \geq 0.$$

Therefore (1) has been successfully proved and therefore Suranji's inequality follows immediately from **Karamata** inequality and the Symmetric Majorization Criterion.

▽

Example 2.11. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be positive real numbers such that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$. Prove the following inequality

$$\frac{a_1 + a_2}{2} \cdot \frac{a_2 + a_3}{2} \dots \frac{a_n + a_1}{2} \leq \frac{a_1 + a_2 + a_3}{3} \cdot \frac{a_2 + a_3 + a_4}{3} \dots \frac{a_n + a_1 + a_2}{3}.$$

(V. Adya Asuren)

SOLUTION. By using **Karamata** inequality for the concave function $f(x) = \ln x$, we only need to prove that the number sequence (x^*) majorizes the number sequence (y^*) in which $(x) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $(y) = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ and for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

$$x_i = \frac{a_i + a_{i+1}}{2}, \quad y_i = \frac{a_i + a_{i+1} + a_{i+2}}{3}$$

(with the common notation $a_{n+1} = a_1$ and $a_{n+2} = a_2$). According to the Symmetric Majorization Criterion, it suffices to prove the following inequality

$$3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |z_i + z_{i+1}| \right) \geq 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |z_i + z_{i+1} + z_{i+2}| \right) \quad (\star)$$

for all real numbers $z_1 \geq z_2 \geq \dots \geq z_n$ and z_{n+1}, z_{n+2} stand for z_1, z_2 respectively.

Notice that $(*)$ is obviously true if $z_i \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Otherwise, assume that $z_1 \geq z_2 \geq \dots \geq z_k \geq 0 > z_{k+1} \geq \dots \geq z_n$. We realize first that it's enough to consider $(*)$ for 8 numbers (instead of n numbers). Now consider it for 8 numbers z_1, z_2, \dots, z_8 . For each number $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}$, we denote $c_i = |z_i|$, then $c_i \geq 0$. To prove this problem, we will prove first the most difficult case $z_1 \geq z_2 \geq z_3 \geq z_4 \geq 0 \geq z_5 \geq z_6 \geq z_7 \geq z_8$. Giving up the absolute value signs, the problem becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3(c_1 + 2c_2 + 2c_3 + c_4 + c_5 + 2c_6 + 2c_7 + c_8 + |c_4 - c_5| + |c_8 - c_1|) \\
& \geq 2(c_1 + 2c_2 + 2c_3 + c_4 + |c_3 + c_4 - c_5| + |c_4 - c_5 - c_6| + c_5 + 2c_6 + 2c_7 + c_8 + |c_7 + c_8 - c_1| + |c_8 - c_1 - c_2|) \\
& \Leftrightarrow c_1 + 2c_2 + 2c_3 + c_4 + c_5 + 2c_6 + 2c_7 + c_8 + 3|c_4 - c_5| + 3|c_8 - c_1| \\
& \geq 2|c_3 + c_4 - c_5| + 2|c_4 - c_5 - c_6| + 2|c_7 + c_8 - c_1| + 2|c_8 - c_1 - c_2|
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, this inequality is obtained by adding the following results

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2|c_4 - c_5| + 2c_3 \geq 2|c_3 + c_4 - c_5| \\
& 2|c_8 - c_1| + 2c_7 \geq 2|c_7 + c_8 - c_1| \\
& |c_4 - c_5| + c_4 + c_5 + 2c_6 \geq 2|c_4 - c_5 - c_6| \\
& |c_8 - c_1| + c_8 + c_1 + 2c_2 \geq 2|c_8 - c_1 - c_2|
\end{aligned}$$

For other cases when there exist exactly three (or five); two (or six); only one (or seven) non-negative numbers in $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_8\}$, the problem is proved completely similarly (indeed, notice that, for example, if $z_1 \geq z_2 \geq z_3 \geq 0 \geq z_4 \geq z_5 \geq z_6 \geq z_7 \geq z_8$ then we only need to consider the similar but simpler inequality of seven numbers after eliminating z_6). Therefore $(*)$ is proved and the conclusion follows immediately.

▽

Using **Karamata** inequality together with the theory of majorization like we have just done it is an original method for algebraic inequalities. By this method, a purely algebraic problem can be transformed to a linear inequality with absolute signs, which is essentially an arithmetic problem, and which can have many original solutions.